



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/714,800

11/17/2003

Heinz Hofmann

15550Z

2932

23389 7590 03/09/2010
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA
SUITE 300
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER

FELTON, AILEEN BAKER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1793

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/09/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10714800	11/17/2003	HOFMANN ET AL.	15550Z

SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA
SUITE 300
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER

JERRY LORENZO

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

1793	20100308
------	----------

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The Examiner's Answer mailed 10/28/2008 contained several inconsistencies which are corrected below:

On the cover page, the statement at the bottom of the page should read: "This is in response to the appeal brief filed 07/09/2008 appealing from the Office action mailed 09/25/2007."

On page 2, Section 6, should read:

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The applicant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct. In addition, the Examiner has established the following new grounds of rejection:

Claims 1, 3-7 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Independent claim 1 (from which claims 3-7 and 10-13 depend) recites that the TATB binds the secondary explosive. This is indefinite, since in all of the examples, a powder is formed and does not show that any binding occurs merely by the addition of the TATB coating. It is unclear how any resultant binding is caused by this coating.

/J.A. LORENZO/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793